

Remarks

[0001] Herein, the "Action" or "Office Action" refers to the non-final Office Action dated March 1, 2007.

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims of the application. Claims 1-18 and 20-22 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 6, 10, 16, and 20. Claim 19 is canceled herein. New claims added herein are None.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0003] If the Office's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then Applicant formally requests an interview with the Examiner of this patent application. I encourage the Examiner to contact me—the undersigned attorney for the Applicant—to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. Please email me at chrisf@leehayes.com. Should you contact me by email, please copy my assistant Carly Taylor (carly@leehayes.com) as well. While email works great for me, I welcome you to call either of us as well.

Substantive Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. §112 Second Paragraph Claim Rejections

[0004] Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite (*Office Action*, p.2). More specifically, the Office indicated that in "line 5, "returning" is an incomplete thought since the context of returning is not clear (*Office Action* p.2). Appropriate correction has been made herein.

[0005] More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a method for communicating object data comprising:

generating a hash value based on object data, wherein the object data includes metadata descriptive of the object data, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by a user of a local computer to represent the user during instant messaging;

storing the object data at a storage location, wherein the object data at the storage location is represented by an object name having the hash value and a location identifier identifying the storage location; and

returning the object name having the hash value and the location identifier identifying the storage location to the user, the object name enabling the user to access the object data including the object type, such that the object type which has been selected by the user can be used to represent the user during instant messaging.

[0006] The amendments to claim 1 make the context of returning clear. The original actions of "generating a hash value based on object

data” and then “storing the object data at a storage location, wherein the object data at the storage location is represented by an object name having the hash value and a location identifier identifying the storage location” are tied to the “returning”. The amendments also make it clear that the object name having the hash value and the location identifier which identifies the storage location are returned to the user, thereby enabling the user to access the object. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the 112 second paragraph rejection be withdrawn.

35 USC § 102 Claim Rejections

[0007] Claims 1-18 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,535,867 to Waters (hereinafter, “Waters”) (*Office Action* p. 3).

[0008] Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance in light of the comments and amendments contained herein. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that the case be passed along to issuance.

[0009] **Claim 1** recites a method for communicating object data comprising:

generating a hash value based on object data, wherein the object data includes metadata descriptive of the object data, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by a user of a local computer to represent the user during instant messaging;

storing the object data at a storage location, wherein the object data at the storage location is represented by an object name having the hash value and a location identifier identifying the storage location; and

returning the object name having the hash value and the location identifier identifying the storage location to the user, the object name enabling the user to access the object data including the object type, such that the object type which has been selected by the user can be used to represent the user during instant messaging.

[0010] In order for Waters to anticipate this claim, Applicant submits that Waters must disclose each and every element and feature of the claim and that they must be arranged in the same manner as the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that Waters does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 1.

[0011] For example, Waters does not show or disclose "generating a hash value based on object data, wherein the object data includes metadata descriptive of the object data, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by a user of a local computer to represent the user during instant messaging", as recited in claim 1.

[0012] To support an assertion of anticipation with regard to the generating element of claim 1, the Office cites Waters, column 7 lines 44-53. The office appears to argue that computing a hash function over a URI of a "Get" request as described in Waters is equivalent to "generating a hash value based on object data, wherein the object data includes metadata descriptive of the object data, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by a user of a local computer to represent the user during instant messaging" (*Office Action*, page 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such an equivalency.

[0013] First, Waters does not show or disclose "generating a hash value based on object data" as recited in claim 1 (Emphasis Added). Instead, Waters describes hashing a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) which identifies a particular resource which is available via a web-server (*Waters*, col.7 lns.24-64).

[0014] Even if the URI of Waters were considered to be "object data", Waters does not show or disclose generating a hash value based on object data, "wherein the object data includes metadata descriptive of the object data, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by a user of a local computer to represent the user during instant messaging", as recited in claim 1.

[0015] Waters does not address instant messaging, but is instead directed to "external file access procedures in resource limited computer

systems" (*Waters*, Background). The URI of Waters simply identifies the location of resources on the World Wide Web. Waters says nothing about the object data including metadata descriptive of the object data. Further, since Waters says nothing about the object data including metadata descriptive of the object data, Waters clearly does not show or disclose that "the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by a user of a local computer to represent the user during instant messaging", as recited in claim 1.

[0016] Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Waters, and Applicant respectfully requests that the 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0017] **Claims 1-15** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Additionally, claims 1-15 may be allowable over Waters for independent reasons. For example:

[0018] **Claim 2** recites in part, "receiving a request for the object data, the request including the object name; and retrieving the object data from a local cache based on the hash value." Water does not show or disclose "retrieving the object data from local cache based on the hash value", as recited in claim 2. In contrast, Waters describes using a hash value to access the external memory (*Waters*, col.7 Ins.64-67).

[0019] **Claim 6** recites in part, "wherein the retrieving the requested object data from the location identified by the location identifier comprises: retrieving the requested object data from a local file system

within the local computer.” In contrast, Waters describes that web-server resources are stored in an external EEPROM 320 (*Waters*, col.7 lns.64-67).

[0020] **Claim 10** recites a computer-readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing a method comprising:

receiving a name associated with a user on a remote computer, the name including location data and a hash value uniquely associated with a data object, wherein the data object includes metadata descriptive of the data object, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by the user to represent the user during instant messaging; and

retrieving the data object from one of a local cache based on the hash value or a location identified by the location data, such that the object type which has been selected by the user can be used to represent the user during instant messaging.

[0021] In order for Waters to anticipate this claim, Applicant submits that Waters must disclose each and every element and feature of the claim and that they must be arranged in the same manner as the claim. Claim 10 is rejected under similar rational as set forth in the rejection of claim 1, and Applicant respectfully submits that based on reasoning similar to that discussed above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Waters does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of amended claim 10. For example, Waters does not show or disclose “wherein the data object

includes metadata descriptive of the data object, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by the user to represent the user during instant messaging", as recited in claim 10. For the sake of brevity, Applicant has not repeated all of the arguments.

[0022] Further, Waters does not show or disclose "retrieving the data object from one of a local cache based on the hash value or a location identified by the location data, such that the object type which has been selected by the user can be used to represent the user during instant messaging", as recited in claim 10. Instead, Waters describes hashing a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) which identifies a particular resource which is available at and external memory, via a web-server (*Waters*, col.7 Ins.24-67).

[0023] Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable over Waters for at least these reasons, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0024] **Claims 11-15** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 10. Additionally, claims 11-15 may be allowable over Waters for independent reasons.

[0025] **Claim 16** A system for managing objects representing users in an instant messaging conversation, the system comprising:

 a data object, wherein the data object includes metadata descriptive of the data object, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by a user of a local computer to represent the user during instant messaging, the data object having an object name including a location identifier and a hash value; and

 an object store operable to retrieve the data object from a location identified by the location identifier and store the data object in a local cache based on the hash value, such that the object type which has been selected by the user can be used to represent the user during instant messaging.

[0026] In order for Waters to anticipate this claim, Applicant submits that Waters must disclose each and every element and feature of the claim and that they must be arranged in the same manner as the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that Waters does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 16.

[0027] For example, Waters does not show or disclose "a data object, wherein the data object includes metadata descriptive of the data object, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by a user of a local computer to represent the user during instant messaging, the data object having an object name including a location identifier and a hash value", as recited in claim 16.

[0028] To support an assertion of anticipation with regard to this element of claim 16, the Office cites Waters, column 7 line 44 to column 8 line 30 (*Office Action*, p. 5). The office appears to argue that the URI of Waters is equivalent to "the data object" of claim 16. Applicant respectfully disagrees with such an equivalency. The URI of Waters is not a data object that "includes metadata descriptive of the data object, and wherein the metadata includes a type field indicating an object type which has been selected by a user of a local computer to represent the user during instant messaging", as recited in claim 16.

[0029] Further, Waters does not show or disclose "the data object having an object name including a location identifier and a hash value", as recited in claim 16. Instead, Waters describes using a hash of a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) to access a particular resource which is available at an external memory (*Waters*, col.7 Ins.24-67). There is no description of an object name which includes both a location identifier and a hash value.

[0030] Still further, Waters does not show or disclose "an object store operable to retrieve the data object from a location identified by the location identifier and store the data object in a local cache based on the hash value, such that the object type which has been selected by the user can be used to represent the user during instant messaging", as recited in claim 16. Instead, Waters describes using a hash of a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) to access a particular resource from an external memory (*Waters*, col.7 Ins.24-67).

[0031] Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 16 is allowable over Waters, and Applicant respectfully requests that the 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0032] **Claims 17, 18, and 20-22** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 16. Additionally, claims 17, 18 and 20-22 may be allowable over Waters for independent reasons.

Dependent Claims

[0033] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant submits that the Office withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0034] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 5-10-2007

By: 

Christen M. Fairborn
Reg. No. 55,164
(509) 324-9256 x249
chrisf@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com